

DENNIS C. REICH, ESQ. (SBN #69631)
 Reich and Binstock, LLP
 4265 San Felipe, Suite 1000
 Houston, Texas 77027
 Tel: 713.622.7271
 Fax: 713.623.8724
 Email: dreich@reichandbinstock.com

Counsel for Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
 PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT
 LITIGATION

MDL No. 3084 CRB

Honorable Charles R. Breyer

This Document Relates to:

*A.E. v. Uber Technologies, et al., Inc., et al.;
 3:25-cv-07668-CRB; and*

**PLAINTIFF’S RESPONSE IN
 OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS UBER
 TECHNOLOGIES, INC., RASIER, LLC,
 AND RASIER-CA, LLC’S MOTION TO
 COMPEL COMPLIANCE WITH COURT
 ORDER (ECF 4575)**

Date: February 13, 2026

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Courtroom: 6 – 17th Floor

I. Introduction

On November 19, 2025, the Court filed an Order to Show Cause, which seeks additional information from Plaintiff, A.E. regarding the origin of a submitted ride receipt. See *Docket No. 4440*. Counsel for Plaintiff A.E., provided Plaintiff with a copy of the Court’s Order which required A.E. to submit for a deposition within 30 days (by December 19, 2025). Plaintiff’s counsel continues to be unable to meaningfully respond to the Order, as this Plaintiff has been and remains uncooperative and unresponsive to multiple contact attempts. Prior to the Court’s issuance of the Order to Show Cause, Counsel intended to withdraw for those reasons. (ECF 4249).

Since that time, Plaintiff’s counsel has cooperated with Uber in an effort to comply with the Court’s Order. Despite counsel’s full disclosure of continued lack of communications with the Plaintiff, as well as no representations that A.E. would appear, Uber insisted upon noticing

1 Plaintiff, A.E.'s in-person deposition in Las Vegas, Nevada. Uber noticed the deposition for
2 Wednesday, December 17, 2025, and by agreement Plaintiff's counsel provided the notice to
3 Plaintiff, A.E. Given that counsel does not know the reason for the lack of communication from
4 the Plaintiff, counsel expressed concern that the Plaintiff may show up unilaterally, however
5 unlikely. Prior to the deposition, on December 15, 2025, Plaintiff's counsel again notified Uber
6 that they had not been in contact with the Plaintiff and made no representation that Plaintiff would
7 appear for deposition. Nonetheless, Uber continued to insist upon moving forward with the in-
8 person deposition. On Wednesday, December 17, 2025, the deposition occurred with counsel
9 present and Uber took a certificate of non-appearance by A.E.

10 Plaintiff does not oppose Defendant's proposed order seeking to further compel a
11 deposition within 30 days; however, Plaintiff counsel cannot represent that the Plaintiff will
12 appear.

13 Plaintiff *does* oppose Uber's sought relief to compel the extraordinary remedy directed
14 solely at Plaintiff's counsel to compel a sworn declaration that addresses counsel's pre-suit
15 investigation as to the claims of Plaintiff, A.E., including a privilege log of all communications
16 with the Plaintiff. This is not ordinary discovery. It is an attempt to narrow a dispute about a sole
17 receipt into an open-ended inquiry into counsel's conduct, mental impression, work product, and
18 privileged communications with clients.

19 Discovery of that sort requires more than suspicion; it requires a plausible theory of
20 misconduct and a legally viable endpoint. Here, the only conceivable endpoint for Uber's counsel-
21 targeted discovery is a claim that counsel filed frivolous actions without adequate investigation,
22 *i.e.*, Rule 11 sanctions. However, Rule 11 sets a high bar: Uber would have to show that the claims
23 were both baseless and filed without a reasonable and competent inquiry at the time of filing.
24 Uber has not made that showing and cannot make that showing on this record.

25 The receipt at issue is not an obvious forgery. Uber itself had to enlist a forensic expert to
26 identify subtle anomalies. Further, Uber has not shown that Plaintiff's claims were impossible,
27
28

1 only that limited corroborating evidence – not uncommon in alleged sexual assault cases – may
2 be disputed. Uber has not shown that a reasonable pre-suit investigation would necessarily have
3 uncovered the alleged issues at the time these claims were filed.

4 Uber's efforts to probe counsel's pre-suit investigation and attorney-client
5 communications without articulating a viable legal basis for doing so should be rejected.
6

7 **II. Argument**

8 **A. Plaintiff does not oppose the Court-Ordered Deposition; Plaintiff solely** 9 **opposes Uber's attempt to target Plaintiff counsel.**

10 Plaintiff opposes Uber's decision to append to an otherwise routine motion to compel a
11 set of novel, intrusive, and undisclosed demands directed at Plaintiff counsel, including a sworn
12 declaration regarding counsel's pre-suit investigation and a privilege log of all communication
13 with Plaintiff, A.E. This request for relief amounts to nothing more than a fishing expedition.
14

15 Discovery is not an abstract entitlement. It must be tethered to a legitimate legal theory
16 and a plausible procedural endpoint. When discovery targets opposing counsel's conduct, mental
17 impressions, or privileged communications with clients, that endpoint must be especially clear.
18 Here, Uber offers none.

19 **B. The only plausible destination for Uber's Counsel-Targeted Discovery is** 20 **Rule 11 – and Uber cannot meet the Rule 11 standard.**

21
22 Uber's request to probe counsel's pre-suit investigation and attorney-client privileged
23 communications cannot be justified as ordinary merits discovery. That information is not relevant
24 to whether Plaintiff was assaulted, whether Uber breached a standard of care, or whether Plaintiff
25 suffered damages. Nor is it relevant to whether the receipt at issue is authentic.

26 The only conceivable reason to demand discovery into counsel's pre-suit investigation
27 and communications is to argue that counsel filed claims that should never have been filed, that
28

1 is, to pursue Rule 11 sanctions or some analogous theory premised on counsel misconduct. Rule
2 11 sets a high and specific bar, and Uber has not come close to satisfying it.

3 1. Rule 11 requires more than a showing that evidence is later challenged
4 or disproven.

5
6 In the Ninth Circuit, Rule 11 sanctions require a showing that a filing was both “baseless
7 and made without a reasonable and competent inquiry.” *Holgate v. Baldwin*, 425 F.3d 671, 676
8 (9th Cir. 2005) (quoting *Townsend v. Holman Consulting Corp.*, 929 F.2d 1358, 1362 (9th Cir.
9 1990) (en banc)).

10 Critically, this inquiry is ex ante, not retrospective. Courts evaluate reasonableness “under
11 the circumstances” at the time the pleading was filed, not with the benefit of hindsight or later-
12 developed expert analysis. *Townsend*, 929 F.2d at 1362; *Golden Eagle Distrib. Corp. v.*
13 *Burroughs Corp.*, 801 F.2d 1531, 1537 (9th Cir. 1986).

14
15 It is therefore not enough for Uber to show that certain corroborating documents are now
16 disputed. Uber would need to show that, at the time of filing, the claims were objectively baseless
17 and that a reasonable attorney would necessarily have discovered that fact through a competent
18 pre-filing inquiry. Uber has not done so and cannot do so.

19 2. The receipt at issue is not facially or obviously fraudulent.

20
21 The receipt at issue here is not an obvious forgery. It does not bear conspicuous
22 watermarks or glaring formatting errors. To the contrary, Uber itself enlisted an outside forensic
23 expert to identify subtle anomalies, including metadata issues, timing inconsistencies, and
24 formatting characteristics. These issues are not apparent on a reasonable, ordinary review.

25 This point is important. Rule 11 does not require counsel to conduct pre-suit forensic
26 analysis of documents, nor to assume that a document is fraudulent in the absence of glaring red
27 flags. The Ninth Circuit has repeatedly emphasized that the duty is one of reasonable inquiry, not
28

1 exhaustive investigation or clairvoyance. *Holgate*, 425 F.3d at 676; *Golden Eagle*, 801 F.2d at
 2 1537. “If the relevant facts are in control of the opposing party, more leeway must be given to
 3 make allegations in the early stages of litigation that may not be well-grounded.” *Townsend v.*
 4 *Holman Consulting Corp.* (9th Cir. 1990) 929 F.2d 1358, 1364. Uber alone has access to its ride
 5 databases that will confirm or deny the existence of a ride described in a receipt provided by a
 6 prospective plaintiff.
 7

8 Where alleged falsity is not facial and must be established through specialized analysis, it
 9 cannot plausibly be said that a reasonable pre-suit inquiry would necessarily uncovered it.

10 3. Uber has not shown that a reasonable pre-suit inquiry would have
 11 revealed the alleged issues at the time of filing.
 12

13 Uber has not shown that a reasonable attorney, conducting a reasonable inquiry at the time
 14 these claims were filed, would necessarily have discovered that the receipt at issue is not genuine.
 15 The Ninth Circuit’s sanctions cases imposing liability on counsel involve circumstances where
 16 attorneys ignored clear warnings, internal contradictions, or dispositive contrary evidence already
 17 in their possession. *See, e.g., Holgate*, 425 F.3d at 677–78(*claims legally impossible and*
 18 *contradicted by existing records*).
 19

20 That is clearly not the case here. There is no evidence that counsel was confronted with
 21 obvious inconsistencies, external warnings, or dispositive facts that would have rendered reliance
 22 on Plaintiff’s representations unreasonable at the time they filed their complaints.

23 **C. Because Uber has not and cannot articulate a Plausible Destination for**
 24 **Counsel-Targeted Discovery, that relief should be denied.**

25 Discovery directed at opposing counsel must be justified by more than suspicion
 26 or frustration. It must be tethered to a legally viable theory and a procedurally proper endpoint.
 27 Here, the only conceivable endpoint is Rule 11 sanctions, but Uber cannot satisfy Rule 11’s
 28

1 governing standard.

2
3 Plaintiff solely opposes Uber's attempt to bootstrap a routine discovery dispute
4 into an intrusive inquiry into counsel's conduct without first establishing that counsel's conduct
5 is even plausibly sanctionable.

6 Because Uber has not shown that Plaintiff's claims were both baseless and filed
7 without a reasonable and competent inquiry, it's request for counsel-targeted discovery lacks a
8 legitimate purpose and should be denied.

9 **III. Conclusion**

10 Plaintiff does not oppose any further order compelling a deposition within 30 days.
11 Plaintiff does oppose a sworn declaration from Plaintiff's counsel that addresses counsel's pre-
12 suit investigation as to the claims of Plaintiff, A.E., including a privilege log of all
13 communications with A.E., as this request is an unjustified intrusion into core opinion work
14 product and privileged communications. Uber has not exhausted less intrusive alternatives, has
15 not satisfied the standards governing discovery directed solely at opposing counsel, and has not
16 established a factual predicate for a broad inquiry into Reich & Binstock, LLP's conduct.
17 Accordingly, Plaintiff requests that the Court deny Defendant's Motion to Compel.

18
19 Dated: December 19, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

20 By: /s/ Dennis C. Reich
21 DENNIS C. REICH (SBN #69631)
22 Reich & Binstock, LLP
23 4265 San Felipe, Suite 1000
24 Houston, Texas 77027
25 Tel: 713.622.7271
26 Fax: 713.623.8724
27 Email: dreich@reichandbinstock.com

28 *Counsel for Plaintiff*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on Friday, December 19, 2025, I electronically transmitted the foregoing Motion to Withdraw as Counsel of Record to the Clerk's office using the CM/ECF system for filing thereby transmitting a Notice of Electronic Filing to all CM/ECF registrants.

/s/ Dennis R. Reich
Dennis R. Reich